DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 105 SP 030 523

AUTHOR Enz, Billie; And Others
TITLE Arizona Teacher Residency Project.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs (Providence, RI, June 10-12, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Inservice Teacher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Mentors; Observation; *Teacher Evaluation; *Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

The Arizona Teacher Residency Project combines in partnership the Center for Educational Development, the College of Education at Northern Arizona University, and more than 60 school districts throughout the state. With the common goal of promoting excellence in education by bringing the art and science of teaching to the conscious level, three geographically separate projects train "mentor" and "resident" teachers to use an instrument which assesses 30 teaching competencies. Resident teachers are in the first, second, or third year of teaching. Both mentor and residents receive 16 hours of training in the skills of observation, scripting, and analysis of classroom performance. Mentor teachers are also taught coaching and conferencing techniques, and each mentor works with a resident to develop an instructional improvement plan. The project's research agenda is three-fold: (1) mentors and residents evaluate the training and the mentoring process, providing feedback for further refinement of the projects; (2) observation data provide feedback to teacher training programs, enabling programs to assess the effectiveness of their preservice training; and (3) analysis of observational data for each participating school district is summarized and returned to the district, enabling districts to identify specific staff development needs. Instruments for evaluating teaching plans and materials, classroom procedures, and interpersonal skills are included. (Author/JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED298105

# Arizona Teacher Residency Project

Introduction and Description of the Arizona Teacher Residency Project.
Dr. Billie Enz, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-111

Arizona Teacher Residency Instrument and the Training Component for Mentors and Residents.
Don Lawhead and Barbara Weber, Center for Educational Development, Tucson, AZ

Arizona Teacher Residency Project and Perservice Teacher Preparation Programs.
Dr. Cynthia Nelson, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Arizona Teacher Residency Project Research Agenda.
Dr. Gary Anderson, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85287-1111

presented
at the

Association of Teacher Educators
Leadership Academy on
Planning and Implementing Induction and
Beginning Teacher Support Programs

June 10-12, 1988
Providence, Rhode Island

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B.J. Enz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 030 523

## Arizona Department of Education

## School Improvement Unit

Northern Arizona University

ATRP

focus

-preservice teacher preparation

training cooperating teachers and student teachers

-undergraduate research
entry level skills
skill development

Center for Educational Development

Pima County

focus

-inservice teachers training

training Mentors/Resident Teams

-material development

-training program

-staff development

Arizona State University

Maricopa County

focus

-inservice teachers

training Mentor & Resident Teams

-research center

project refinement
staff development
college program assessment

-training program

-initial stages of involving cooperating teachers

## DISTRICTS THROUGHOUT STATE OF ARIZONA

## ARIZONA TEACHER RESIDENCY PROJECT

The Arizona Teacher Residency Project is funded by the Arizona Department of Education and combines in partnership, the efforts of The Center for Educational Development and the College of Education at Northern Arizona University, and Arizona State University, plus over 60 school districts throughout the state of Arizona.

With the common goal of promoting excellence in education by bringing the art and science of teaching to the conscious level, the three separate Residency Projects share a similar training process and the same observation instrument which identifies 30 observable and measurable teaching competencies. The Arizona Teacher Residency Instrument is based on an observation model developed in Georgia and introduced to Arizona in 1983.

The Pima County Teacher Residency Project, located at the Center for Educational Development in Tucson, provides 16 hours of Teacher Residency training to Mentor and Resident teachers. After Mentor and Resident (1st, 2nd, and 3rd year teachers) learn and practice the skills of observation, scripting and analysis they are trained to apply the analyzed observation notes to the instrument to determine a level of performance. The Mentor teachers are further taught coaching and conferencing techniques and work

with the Resident to develop an instructional improvement plan. By combining knowledge of concepts, demonstration, practice, feedback and coaching, both technical skills and on the job application are increased.

Pima County has also developed a teaching skills resource handbook and video tapes which supplement the training sessions.

The Arizona Teacher Residency Project at Northern Arizona University (NAU) in Flagstaff, has adapted the project and incorporates the Teacher Residency training as part of the curriculum for the teacher preparation program. Further, NAU uses the ATRP instrument as the main source of data to document the skill development of pre-service teachers during performance-based activities and during the student teaching internship. NAU provides the Teacher Residency training to the cooperating teachers to which their student teachers are assigned.

NAU is conducting research on the acquisition of teaching skills and the developmental nature of teaching.

The Maricopa County Teacher Residency Project at Arizona State University (ASU) in Tempe, also provides Teacher Residency training to in-service Mentor and Resident teachers and is beginning to work in conjunction with the Professional Field Experience office at ASU to provide

Teacher Residency training for the cooperating teachers to which their student teachers are assigned.

The ASU/Maricopa County Teacher Residency Project serves as the research center for all three projects. The research agenda is three fold;

1. Mentor and resident teachers evaluate the training sessions and the Mentoring process which provides feedback to further refine the Teacher Residency Training.
2. The observation data will provide feedback to the teacher training programs. The performance of recent graduates will enable the programs to better assess the effectiveness of the preservice training.
3. The analysis of the observational data is returned to the participating school districts in global form, thus enabling the district to identify specific staff development needs.

# TEACHING PLANS AND MATERIALS

Directions: Mark the one description which best applies to the lesson observed. If more information is needed, mark the appropriate "to clarify" box. Once this information is clarified, mark the one descriptor that best applies.

## 1. Specifies Objectives for the Lesson

| First Observation FALL | | | | Second Observation SPRING | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.1 | The instructional plans include no objectives. | 1.1 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.2 | The plans include objectives which are written in broad non-measurable terms. | 1.2 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.3 | The plans include objectives that with only a few exceptions are written in observable, measurable terms. | 1.3 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.4 | All objectives are written in observable, measurable terms. | 1.4 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.5 | In addition to the items included above, the objectives have been appropriately sequenced. | 1.5 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.6 N/A | Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed. | N/A 1.6 ☐ | ☐ | |

| Rationale: Fall | Rationale: Spring |
|---|---|
| | |

## 2. Specifies Teaching Procedures for Lesson

| First Observation FALL | | | | Second Observation SPRING | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.1 | Plans do not specify teaching procedures. | 2.1 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.2 | Teaching procedures are limited or seem inappropriate for objectives. | 2.2 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.3 | Teaching procedures are referenced to the objectives. | 2.3 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.4 | All teaching procedures are appropriate for the objectives. | 2.4 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.5 | In addition to the above, plans specify procedures for both teacher-centered and student-centered approaches. | 2.5 ☐ | ☐ | |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.6 N/A | Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed. | N/A 2.6 ☐ | ☐ | |

| Rationale: Fall | Rationale: Spring |
|---|---|
| | |

# CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

Directions: Mark the one description which best applies to the lesson observed. If more information is needed, mark the appropriate "to clarify" box. Once this information is clarified, mark the one descriptor that best applies.

## 1. Uses Instructional Equipment and Other Aids

| First Observation FALL | | | | Second Observation SPRING | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.1 | Instructional equipment (e.g., projectors) or appropriate aids (e.g., posters, charts) are not used. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.2 | Equipment or instructional aids are used but are not relevant to the objective(s). | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.3 | Teacher effectively uses instructional equipment or other instructional aids at appropriate times in the lesson. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.4 | Teacher is highly skillful in using instructional equipment or aids at appropriate times. Media blends smoothly with other kinds of instruction. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.5 | In addition to the above, teacher uses original instructional aids which are relevant to the objective(s). | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 1.6 N/A | Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed. N/A | ☐ | ☐ |

| Rationale: Fall | Rationale: Spring |
|---|---|
| | |

## 2. Uses Instructional Materials To Encourage Appropriate Practice

| First Observation FALL | | | | Second Observation SPRING | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.1 | Materials chosen are not relevant to topic or objectives or no materials are used when needed. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.2 | Materials chosen are related to the topics being studied but not to the objective(s). | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.3 | Most materials chosen provide for practice on specific objectives. Practice may be insufficient in quantity to achieve the objective(s). | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.4 | Materials chosen are relevant to the objectives. Students are given ample opportunity to practice the objective(s). | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.5 | In addition to the above, progress assessment techniques are used to determine whether the practice individual students receive is sufficient. | ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | 2.6 N/A | Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed. N/A | ☐ | ☐ |

| Rationale: Fall | Rationale: Spring |
|---|---|
| | |

# INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

Directions: Mark the one description which best applies to the lesson observed. If more information is needed, mark the appropriate "to clarify" box. Once this information is clarified, mark the one descriptor that best applies.

## 1. Communicates Enthusiasm

| First Observation FALL | | | Second Observation SPRING |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | 1.1 | None | 1.1 ☐ |
| ☐ | 1.2 | One | 1.2 ☐ |
| ☐ | 1.3 | Two | 1.3 ☐ |
| ☐ | 1.4 | Three | 1.4 ☐ |
| ☐ | 1.5 | Four | 1.5 ☐ |
| ☐ | 1.6 | N/A | N/A 1.6 ☐ |

of the descriptors are evident

Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed.

| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | a | Eye contact or facial expressions communicate pleasure, concern, interest, etc. | a ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | b | Voice inflections stress points of interest and importance. | b ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | c | Posture (moving around room or sitting among students) communicates enthusiasm. | c ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | d | Gestures to accentuate points communicate enthusiasm. | d ☐ | ☐ |

Rationale: Fall

Rationale: Spring

## 2. Demonstrates Warmth and Friendliness

| First Observation FALL | | | Second Observation SPRING |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | 5.1 | None | 5.1 ☐ |
| ☐ | 2.2 | One | 2.2 ☐ |
| ☐ | 2.3 | Two | 2.3 ☐ |
| ☐ | 2.4 | Three | 2.4 ☐ |
| ☐ | 2.5 | Four | 2.5 ☐ |
| ☐ | 2.6 | N/A | N/A 2.6 ☐ |

of the descriptors are evident

Check this box only when the entire scale is determined inappropriate to the lesson observed.

| To Clarify | Observed | | | To Clarify | Observed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | a | Teacher asks about students' interests and opinions. | a ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | b | Teacher smiles at students or laughs or jokes with them. | b ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | c | Teacher sits or stands near students. | c ☐ | ☐ |
| ☐ | ☐ | d | Teacher uses students' names in a warm and friendly way. | d ☐ | ☐ |

Rationale: Fall

Rationale: Spring

TARGET

TEACHER RESIDENCY PROGRAM
INSTRUMENT ITEMS

## TEACHING PLANS AND MATERIALS

1. SPECIFIES OBJECTIVES FOR THE LESSON
2. SPECIFIES TEACHING PROCEDURES FOR THE LESSON
3. SPECIFIES RESOURCES FOR THE LESSON
4. SPECIFIES PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING STUDENT PROGRESS
5. PLANS FOR ALL LEVELS OF COGNITIVE THINKING
6. PLANS FOR VARIETY OF STUDENT ABILITIES AND STYLES
7. PLANS INCLUDE MONITORING STUDENT PROGRESS AND PROVIDING FEEDBACK

## CLASSROOM PROCEDURES

1. USES INSTRUCTIONAL EQUIPMENT AND OTHER AIDS
2. USES INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS TO ENCOURAGE APPROPRIATE PRACTICE
3. GIVES DIRECTIONS AND EXPLANATIONS RELATED TO LESSON
4. PRESENTS INFORMATION WHICH RELATES DIRECTLY TO THE OBJECTIVE
5. USES STUDENT RESPONSES AND QUESTIONS IN TEACHING
6. PROVIDES STUDENT FEEDBACK THROUGHOUT LESSON
7. USES A VARIETY OF TEACHING METHODS APPROPRIATELY AND EFFECTIVELY
8. DEMONSTRATES ABILITY TO WORK WITH INDIVIDUALS, SMALL GROUPS & LARGE GROUPS
9. FOCUSES STUDENT ATTENTION EARLY IN LESSON
10. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARTICIPATION
11. MAINTAINS STUDENT INVOLVEMENT
12. PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR CLOSURE OR SUMMARIZATION
13. PROVIDES INSTRUCTION WHICH PROMOTES STUDENTS' RETENTION
14. DEMONSTRATES KNOWLEDGE IN SUBJECT AREA
15. ATTENDS TO ROUTINE TASKS
16. USES INSTRUCTIONAL TIME EFFECTIVELY
17. MAINTAINS AN ATTRACTIVE AND STIMULATING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

## INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

1. COMMUNICATES ENTHUSIASM
2. DEMONSTRATES WARMTH AND FRIENDLINESS
3. IS SENSITIVE TO NEEDS AND FEELINGS OF STUDENTS
4. PROVIDES FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS ABOUT BEHAVIOR
5. MAINTAINS POSITIVE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR
6. MANAGES DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR

CED Center for Educational Development

Arizona Teacher Residency Program
Center for Excellence in Education
Northern Arizona University

Overview: The Center for Excellence in Education in cooperation with the Teacher Residency Program of the Arizona Department of Education has engaged in a pilot project to study the use of a performance assessment instrument in the development of a teacher education database. The project was designed to determine whether a teacher observation instrument can be effectively utilized in an undergraduate program prior to student teaching and can the instrument be used during the student teaching internship to assess readiness for certification. The project sought to identify students' strengths and weaknesses in teaching so that one could determine the areas of the undergraduate teacher education program that indicated the need for revision or reform. The study hoped to tie pre-service and in-service together in a way that would enhance collaborative relationships between universities and public schools.

In November of 1983, Arizona Governor Bruce Babbitt's Committee on Quality Education released their report, Education in Arizona: Popular Concerns and Unpopular Choices. This report was critical of the Colleges of Education in Arizona as well as those in the nation. Their findings stated:

1. Teachers need a stronger background in academic subject matter.
2. Colleges of Education place too much emphasis on methodology of questionable relevance.

Their recommendations for improvement included:

1. Student teaching time should be increased.
2. The quality of supervisors of the student teacher should be improved.
3. There should be more emphasis on human relations and communication skills.
4. There is a need for cooperation and interaction within the universities' academic disciplines and the Colleges of Education.

On June 30, 1984, the College of Education at Northern Arizona University was abolished and on July 1, 1984 the Center for Excellence in Education was established. From its first day of operation, the Center for Excellence in Education (CEE) has focused on reform to improve undergraduate teacher preparation. Dr. David Williams, Executive Director of the CEE, adopted four major priorities that are designed to be responsive to the issues raised by the Committee on Quality Education. These priorities are:

1. The teacher preparation program must assure quality control. A competency-based program with a performance-based strategy was envisioned.
2. The teacher preparation program must have a strong experiential flavor. It was projected that students would have more extensive experiences earlier in their training.

3. The teacher preparation program must be based on a sound academic preparation and interdisciplinary in the sense that it would draw on the expertise of the academic disciplines across the campus. Similarily, it must bring the talents of all areas within the CEE to bear on the preparation of teachers and educational leaders.
4. The teacher preparation program must develop with a strong multicultural component through an emphasis on Indian Education, Bilingual Education, and Minority Education, which would be developed in close contact with the socio-economic needs of the state.

The undergraduate teacher preparation program is a top priority at the Center for Excellence in Education and the experience-base became the primary focus in the assessment of the CEE's teacher preparation program. It was observed that a mismatch exists between much of what happens on a university campus in the name of teacher education and what is actually demanded on-the-job in the public school classroom. The CEE recognized the major gap between the rather conventional teacher education curriculum and the realities of student and resident teaching in the field. It was assumed that candidates were ready to student teach if they had completed the coursework of education and methods courses with adequate grades. There was no formal pre-student teaching check of teaching skills and no determination whether an integration of knowledge and skill had occurred. A consensus grew that the experience-base was too limited in the CEE's curriculum and that there was a need for a new emphasis on skill development which would contribute to greater curricular accountability and quality control of graduates.

Arizona Teacher Residency Program (ATRP): The ATRP is the primary teacher observation instrument adopted by the Arizona Department of Education and therefore, it has been used extensively, although not exclusively, in the CEE's pre-student teaching and student teaching intern performance evaluations. In the mid-1980's, the Arizona Department of Education adapted the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Inventories (TPAI) into the Arizona Teacher Residency Program (ATRP). The instrument identifies observable and measurable teaching skills together with public school districts expectations. The ATRP provided the necessary foundation for teacher development along researchable lines. The ATRP is presently the main data-gathering instrument which the CEE uses to document the development of skills among students during performance-based activities and during the student teaching internship. Students are typically observed three times during their undergraduate years and three to seven times during their student teaching internship. These observations are key to forming the data base for reform in the CEE's undergraduate program. The ATRP instrument is used during the training phase to determine rates of student progress and to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the CEE's teacher education curriculum. The ATRP is administered immediately before student teaching to measure readiness for placement in the classroom and to provide the school with a profile of the student teacher's strengths and weaknesses at the beginning of the internship assignment in the public school. The ATRP is used in the three to seven observations of the student teacher to provide an assurance of the quality of individual graduates. This also indicates the extent to which the CEE's curriculum is successful in producing qualified teachers. The ATRP helps prepare student teachers for the observational assessments they will experience as novice and tenured teachers.

Results of the Project: The study was conducted over three semesters with data gathered on one hundred and thirty-nine students. Definitive conclusions are not possible, but it is hoped that the results will generate direction and encourage persistence in the pursuit of a database which enhances curriculum development at the Center for Excellence in Education. This was an internal, institutional pilot project and the results are presented in the spirit of sharing a self-study experience in the early stages with other universities.

There are some specific cautions that should be employed while considering the findings:

1. This was not a random sample of students. Subjects were selected by soliciting the cooperation of faculty members and students. The information reported is based on the efforts of faculty and students who volunteered.
2. This was not a longitudinal study. Students were selected from those enrolled at various stages of their professional preparation.
3. The subjects were selected from the areas of elementary, secondary, and special education. The students at the beginning level were selected from two sections of Introduction to Education (EFD 200). The intermediate level students were recruited from special education dual major courses, and the advanced level students enrolled in Methods in Secondary Education (ECI 430). The student teacher interns in the sample were assigned to elementary schools.

The intent was to obtain a cross-selection of students from the three major groups at the CEE and to determine what patterns emerged. The study was designed with the intention of providing quick feedback for early initiatives of reform. The results of these observations are:

1. Students demonstrate progressively higher scores on the ATRP as they move up the curriculum ladder from lower level to higher level courses. For example, sophomores obtained at 2.14 score across all subtests while juniors scored at the 2.71 level and seniors scored at the 3.20 level. It is clear that students demonstrate increased proficiency on the skills measured by the ATRP as they proceed through the teacher education curriculum.
2. Students perform at their highest level on the Interpersonal Skills (IS) section of the ATRP from the beginning course all the way through the end of the student teaching internship. There are, however, significant differences between the beginning level and the 3.2 level at which student teachers perform.
3. Students score relatively low in the area of Teaching Plans and Materials (TPM) of the ATRP. This raises questions related to how students think about teaching and how they plan for their teaching.
4. Students had relatively low scores on the following items of the ATRP:

   Instruction takes into account learner's abilities and and styles
   Instruction takes into account different rates of learning
   Provides learner feedback
   Monitors student progress
   Uses instructional aids and other equipment
   Specifies procedures for assissing learner progress

Use of the ATRP in undergraduate education proved satisfactory in establishing its usefulness in providing baseline skill data on entering students, formative data on students in training, and summative data on students nearing the end of their pre-student teaching internship. Twenty-five elementary student teacher interns were assessed using the ATRP instrument. Three samples of teaching (pre-mid-post) were observed. One at the start of the semester, a second at mid-semester, and a third at the end of the semester. Interns appeared to maximize their skills as measured by the ATRP instrument, after eight weeks of student teaching. This observation is quite important in terms of length of student teaching experiences and/or the content of those experiences.

The problem found among students observed with the ATRP can be grouped into the areas listed below. They are listed in rank order of severity beginning with the most critical and most frequently identified:

1. Communication
   Poor spoken English usage, the lack of clarity in oral and written expression, spelling problems and poor written communication skills were the major complaints.
2. Lesson Planning
   Problems with thinking through the goals of the lesson, formulating objectives, articulating objectives and procedures, and the documentation of evaluation procedure were major concerns.
3. Professionalism
   Inappropriate attire, inappropriate grooming or hygiene, the lack of tack, the failure to deal with confidential matters properly, and poor school socialization in general were reported.
4. Interpersonal Skills
   Problems with cooperating teachers, parent relationships, inappropriate behaviors and attitudes towards students and others were listed in this area.
5. Instructional Delivery
   Lack of clarity, poor questioning techniques, and inadequate monitoring and feedback were problems encountered.

Summary: This study was conducted to help determine the extent to which the observation instrument of teaching skills (ATRP), adopted by the Arizona Department of Education, could be used in an undergraduate teacher preparation program as a measure of their skill development. It has been concluded from the analysis of the data that the adaptation of the ATRP to a pre-student teaching curriculum as well as in a student teaching internship is justified. The teacher education database, under development at the CEE, appears to be one of the most promising practices of teacher education reform. It has been determined that the teaching skills measured by the ATRP are acquired progressively by students from the sophomore year through the completion of the student teacher internship. The skills students find most difficult are in dealing with individual differences, monitoring students, and evaluating pupil progress. Students score consistently higher on the interpersonal skills subtest. Teacher performance instruments can be used to help verify the skill levels of the pre-service teacher at various stages in the preparation process and they can be utilized to confirm the efficacy of curricular revision. It is clear that the students in this sample were able to demonstrate skills essential to successful teaching. Thus, it seems safe to indicate that the clinical approach associated with the ATRP's use in pre-service and the student teaching internship is warranted.

RESEARCH AGENDA

Arizona Teacher Residency Project

The number one goal of the Arizona Teacher Residency Projects, as stated by the Arizona State Department of Education, is to provide assistance to Arizona school districts for the improvement of instruction. To this end, the research agenda will:

1. Generate summaries of resident teachers' performance profiles from the Arizona Residency Instrument. Relationships between performance profiles and a variety of factors will be investigated. These include demographic characteristics of the resident, the school, the teaching assignment, etc. Summaries will be distributed to school districts with recommendations for staff development and listings of staff development resources.

2. Investigate mentor and resident characteristics which may be related to optimum resident performance. These include mentor and resident demographic information, teaching assignment, etc. Such information may be helpful in recommending the pairings of mentor-resident teams.

A second goal of the Residency Projects is to maintain high levels of training effectiveness and inter-project consistency.

1. Monitor the consistency of the training across projects through the use of common training lesson-tape at the conclusion of each mentor training session.

2. Monitor training effectiveness through analysis of fall and spring performance profiles, immediate and delayed evaluation of training sessions, and administrators' perceptions of performance change.

A third, more long-term goal, is to provide feedback to teacher training programs.

1. The performance of recent graduates will enable such programs to better assess the effectiveness of their training.

2. Investigate developmental aspects of performance on the ATRI. Beginning in the fall, 1988, a number of student teachers will be assessed and then followed and reassessed as resident teachers.